

1 there are very few. They relate to things such as, you
2 know, in this day and age, it would be possible to answer a
3 call, send a data message and hang up. So you're able to
4 use the network and not pay for it.

5 So there are rules in Part 68 that say, "If you
6 answer a call, you've got to stay offhook at least two
7 seconds. By then, we'll have billed you."

8 There's also rules related to -- at one time,
9 there was a lot of single frequency signaling used in
10 networks. And so, there are -- not so much anymore, very
11 few. But there are rules in Part 68 that protect against
12 people having energy in that particular frequency band,
13 because it would interfere with telephone company billing
14 equipment.

15 And there are rules related to the first five
16 seconds after answering. The CPE has to maintain a
17 certain -- the value -- the loop current can't vary by quite
18 a bit during that first five seconds.

19 So there's really very few rules in Part 68
20 related to this. The ones that are in there are related to
21 the particular technologies that are sensitive to this.

22 I still believe some of the most important rules
23 went in in recent years. And they were related to this
24 loophole, essentially, that existed. And that was the --
25 there's now a rule for returning answer supervision, direct

1 inward dialing trunks. And that was as a result of the AT&T
2 position -- petition a few years ago.

3 So I think there are very few rules. The ones
4 that have air are based on particular technologies that
5 exist, various parts in the network. And they're valid.

6 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Mr. Whitesell?

7 MR. WHITESELL: Thank you. Steve Whitesell with
8 Lucent Technologies Consumer Products. I think what we're
9 hearing here is that there -- that the rules, as they exist
10 now, are very useful, very necessary, but that they do
11 change over time. We do have reasons to weed things out.
12 Some of this was done as Anh Wride pointed out with the
13 harmonization of the Part 68 rules with the CS03 rules in
14 Canada. And so, we have been through a process where we
15 have eliminated some of the unnecessary rules that were
16 there.

17 Perhaps over time, as Trone has just alluded to,
18 the need for single frequency billing protection will go
19 away, and that rule should be eliminated. And yet, there
20 are other rules, things coming along, ADSL and so on, that
21 we need new rules for. So there is a need for rules, and
22 there is a need for a very expeditious matter of dealing
23 with those rules and making the changes as it becomes
24 necessary.

25 And that's part of this afternoon's discussion,

1 actually. But I think we do need the rules and the idea of
2 having the rules exist in an ANSI standard that can be
3 pointed to from within the codified Part 68 is what industry
4 I think, in general, is very supportive of.

5 MR. BERRESFORD: If I could wrap it up? Yes,
6 please. Mr. Chamney?

7 MR. CHAMNEY: Chamney.

8 MR. BERRESFORD: Yes. I'm sorry.

9 MR. CHAMNEY: I've had discussions of the billing
10 defeating issue with some of our switch engineers. And as a
11 result of those discussions, I'm of the opinion that when
12 all the analogue switches are out of all of the networks,
13 that then, possibly billing can be removed as a harm.

14 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Mr. Hart?

15 MR. HART: My comments follow directly on that.
16 Everyone of the things that's in there now that I know of
17 was put there as a result of a specific problem that was
18 identified. So it's not like there's anything in there that
19 was just somebody's idea of something neat.

20 And I go right to the point here. If this would
21 be under the supervision or, I don't know what you want to
22 call it, of an industry body, when those switches are gone
23 and those problems don't -- aren't real anymore, the
24 manufacturers are going to come in there and say, "Look, we
25 can get rid of those rules because those switches aren't

1 there." And everybody's going to say, "Yeah, that's right."
2 And that's when it'll happen.

3 So that's the process we want to trigger.

4 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. If I can go on to what may
5 be my last question. Okay. And I want to emphasize that in
6 this question I'm just starting, I'm talking about harm very
7 generally described at the same level of generality as the
8 four harms that are now in Part 68 and that I was just
9 talking about.

10 Does new equipment that we expect to come on line
11 in the next few years create the possibility of a new harm
12 that is not in Part 68 now? And I'm thinking in particular
13 of line sharing and DSL. And I believe one party's comments
14 that were filed with us mentioned this in terms of
15 interservice interference. I would value any comments on
16 that.

17 Mr. Salinas?

18 MR. SALINAS: The DSL-type technology, what's he's
19 talking, IAB, whatever level DSL you're talking about, does
20 have an ability to harm itself and other type services. But
21 a majority of that is being covered in the new T(1), E(1).4
22 paperwork on spectrum management that's just been done.
23 Within that document, there are sections of guarded
24 technologies on the network and sections covering nonguarded
25 technologies on the network, and specify that these are the

1 technologies that you have to bill your equipment to, to
2 know what that technology is and you've got to coexist with
3 it.

4 Yes, they can harm each other. It's highly
5 unlikely that they will harm the existing older technology,
6 which is analogue based and which is in a different
7 bandwidth. But the new technologies will harm each other.

8 MR. CHAMNEY: We raised this in our comments.
9 There may be, at some point in the future, a need for -- if
10 line sharing is approved, there may be a need for a new
11 harm, may be defined as carrier-to-carrier interference,
12 where the filters in the CPE of where both pots and ADSL are
13 being used on the same loop to serve two different
14 customers, or even the same customer by two different
15 carriers. That's the scenario where the new might be
16 needed. Or, excuse me. Two different customers by two
17 carriers using the same loop.

18 MR. BERRESFORD: Would that be degradation of
19 service to persons other than the user?

20 MR. CHAMNEY: No.

21 MR. SALINAS: But I can give you an example of
22 that.

23 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay.

24 MR. CHAMNEY: Yeah, maybe it could be. I hadn't
25 visualized it that way when we had had our discussions. But

1 yeah, a second carrier could be an additional person, third
2 party.

3 MR. BERRESFORD: Mr. Hart?

4 MR. HART: Yeah, we dealt with that to some degree
5 of detail in our responses. In the case of a UNIX where the
6 loop is the network element and the service provider that is
7 using it puts a D-slam on it, puts DSL on it, certainly you
8 have a harmonization problem or a potential one anyway where
9 that use of the loop could interfere with existing services
10 on the loop.

11 So the -- I guess to --

12 MR. BERRESFORD: Existing services to whom?

13 MR. HART: To other service providers, to other
14 customers. There could be three or four different entities,
15 let's say, in the same cable that have UNIXs that is the
16 loop. And they could -- if there is no requirement as far
17 as what they can put on that loop, they can bring down the
18 service of a whole bunch of other people in it. And that's
19 one of the reasons the T(1) E(1).4 developing standard is so
20 important because it does deal with those.

21 MR. BERRESFORD: That would fall within the
22 present definition of harm, though, would it not?

23 MR. HART: Yes. The point -- to answer your
24 question more directly, I think the kinds of things that
25 we're looking at today is in DSL, certainly fall within that

1 area of concern. But the details of how you make sure, what
2 rules you would need to make sure that there is a freedom
3 for multiple people to operate in there and to make sure
4 that everybody stays out of everybody else's hair are new.
5 And in our case, we have strongly supported the work going
6 on in T(1) E(1).4 as a way to develop a set of consistent
7 requirements to control that.

8 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Mr. Bishop?

9 MR. BISHOP: Yeah. I would say because the local
10 loop's been opened up to competition, many of the --
11 particularly, the signal power limits and balance limits
12 that have applied to the customer end of the loop, we always
13 apply those internally to the central office end of the loop
14 to avoid cross-talk and other types of interference.

15 When we were the only carrier that used the loop
16 plant, then any interference that our central office
17 equipment would cause, then we had to fix it. Now that
18 there are multiple carriers located in a central office,
19 sharing the loops in the same cable, there's a need really
20 to have some requirements at the central office end of the
21 loop, too. And I hope that the spectrum management standard
22 that's under development in T(1) E(1).4 can be used a basis
23 for developing some requirements for the central office end
24 of the loop, too.

25 I believe there is -- because there is -- if all

1 the carriers don't follow the same rules, then there's a
2 tendency to -- you can increase the range of your product.
3 You can increase the number of loops that your service can
4 work on if you increase your signal power. Then, people,
5 without any type of regulation, carriers would have a
6 tendency to say, well, "Carrier A couldn't reach their
7 residents with a particular service, but I can. I know how
8 to do it. And I do it by jacking up the power." And then
9 the next person is going to do the same thing. And then
10 we -- all we do is create more noise in the cable and
11 interfere with other folks.

12 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Sir, in the --

13 MR. MCNAMARA: Bill McNamara, Bell-South. I'd
14 like to just reemphasize this bold venture (phonetic). This
15 is clearly the case where one party has an opportunity to do
16 something for his own benefit, for his own customers that
17 will clearly harm other users. A very clear case of third-
18 party harm directly resulting from signal power, which is
19 one of the things that Part 68 has attempted to control in
20 the past, has not addressed in the DSL context that has to
21 be dealt with in the future.

22 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

23 MR. SALINAS: An example of what you're talking
24 about as I recently had a case in Dallas, Texas where people
25 were using HDSL equipment that was designed for a campus

1 environment. But since they had remote campuses, they sent
2 a signal across my network. They sent a signal at such a
3 high level that it put 1,800 customers out of business. And
4 the only way I got them off the line was carrying them Part
5 68, and say, "Here's a rule you broke."

6 MR. BERRESFORD: So that's a harm that would be
7 covered by the present Part 68?

8 MR. SALINAS: Yes.

9 MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Sir?

10 MR. BIPES: John Bipes, Mobile Engineering. I
11 recently attended a Bell Corp. seminar entitled, "Mining
12 Copper for Gold." And it helped to illuminate the fact that
13 in the world, there are something like 700 million different
14 subscriber loops in about that many different states of
15 repair or disrepair.

16 And as emerging technologies try to push ever
17 higher data rates, and sometimes that higher power is down
18 those loops, not only do we have difficulty with cross-
19 coupling and interference with other services that may be in
20 the same cable pair or nearby cable pairs, but we've also
21 got an emerging issue with electromagnetic radiation from
22 these twisted copper subscriber lines where we may not only
23 have degradation of wire line services, but degradation to
24 services that are in the RF spectrum, HF, VHF, et cetera.

25 And the power spectral density issue is an

1 enormously complex one, but one that has to be paid
2 attention to.

3 MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

4 MR. HART: I was just going to say that the
5 neatest thing in my view would be to have the T(1) E(1).4
6 standard be satisfactory enough to the industry and to the
7 Commission for the Commission to say -- to be able to say in
8 one way or another, "If you meet that, and you can
9 demonstrate that you meet those requirements to the testing
10 laboratory, then everything is okay." And that would be the
11 kind of a model that I would like to see developed. I
12 realize that's oversimplified, but in some form or another
13 that would be an approach that we would support.

14 MR. BERRESFORD: Yes. One last --

15 MR. SHINN: One quick comment before -- the issue
16 is really, is two issues here. One is, as you indicated
17 here, the line sharing where you have multiple services on a
18 single subscriber loop, and you also were discussing the
19 bundling where you have multiple services within a bundle
20 with third party -- potential third-party harm. So those
21 are the differences in that the harms we're talking about,
22 and as you had indicated, the line sharing, which would be
23 different than multiple bundling.

24 MR. BISHOP: I do want to be able to make a
25 comment this morning. And this is a good place as any to

1 try to work it in. And that was one of the questions
2 related to how Part 68 can be structured to meet the
3 requirements of new technologies.

4 And one thing that they're doing in the T(1)
5 E(1).4 spectrum management standard is they are coming up
6 with a set of generic requirements for signal power limits.
7 And this will help manufacturers.

8 Most of the rules that are in Part 68 are based on
9 certain network services. They studied certain network
10 services and came up with rules that apply. So then, to --
11 TIA and other forums, to make sense of all those rules, they
12 actually in their technical services bulletin 31 where they
13 provide some guidance on testing, they actually then take
14 the rules and sort them out according to the type of
15 interface, loop start, ground start, DDS, DS1, et cetera.

16 So if you are a manufacturer of new technology and
17 you happen to use one of those interfaces that already have
18 rules in Part 68, then you can pretty much get your
19 equipment registered by following the rules for that
20 particular interface. But if you have a new interface, you'
21 won't be able to register your equipment. You'll need a
22 waiver, or you'll need some new rulemaking. You'll need to
23 go through a lengthy process in order to be able to
24 register.

25 But if you look -- but, I believe we can get

1 around that to a large extent if we develop some generic
2 criteria. Because if you actually look at Part 68, many of
3 the rules that are there today are already generic in
4 nature. The environmental simulation rules largely don't
5 really relate to the type of interface. Same with the
6 leakage current requirements.

7 Some of the other rules like on-loop feed
8 (phonetic) and some billing projection, they really do
9 relate only to very specific interfaces. It's really in the
10 area of hazardous voltage and signal hazardous voltage
11 limits, signal power limits and transverse balance limits
12 where if we could come up with a set of generic rules for
13 those particular aspects, then we'd have a set of rules that
14 would be a lot more flexible for people that wanted to
15 introduce new technologies.

16 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. I think we can continue with
17 this topic after a break. We'll break for 15 minutes and be
18 back here at 10:45.

19 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

20 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. If everyone would resume
21 their seats, we can start again. I believe Mr. Bishop was
22 talking about a subject, which was going to lead into a
23 question that I have for all of you.

24 And that is, looking at Part 68 specifically,
25 which we haven't really done yet specifically in terms of

1 rule parts, I think the industry -- all the comments seemed
2 unanimous. No matter what else you said, you all agreed
3 that the FCC has problems with delay of getting rules
4 changed when they need to be changed. And I wondered if you
5 could point out which specific rule section caused the most
6 delay or the most problematic. We've talked about the ones
7 that you want to keep, you know, this morning. But which
8 ones cause delay in Part 68?

9 MR. SALINAS: In bringing about the market?

10 MS. MAGNOTTI: Exactly.

11 MR. SALINAS: The biggest issue is, and correct me
12 if I'm in error. The biggest issue is the time period it
13 takes to get something registered, about the six-week time
14 period. It has nothing to do with the technology. It's
15 just a process you go through to get there.

16 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. Well, that's a subject for
17 tomorrow morning, the register. But I did ask. You're
18 right. But I was looking more for technical rules in terms
19 of rulemakings. When rules have to be changed, which ones
20 are the ones that cause problems?

21 MR. WHITESELL: Perhaps I'll stick my neck out on
22 the line here, but -- and there are others around the table
23 who could address this better than I, but the TR41.9
24 committee worked very quickly to get a harmonized rule.
25 Maybe not that quickly, but they did come up with a

1 harmonized rule section that was harmonized between the U.S.
2 and Canada. Canada had adopted it for nearly two years
3 before it became a Part 68 rule. And I don't think it was
4 anything other than just the process. It was nothing
5 specific about the technology or the rules.

6 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. But which rules now exist
7 which are in the way? Yes?

8 MR. SHINN: I've got two areas that I'm going to
9 talk about. One is, the stutter dial tone has been
10 available for the Alameda order for a number of years. And
11 the issues -- everything is there. It's presently handled
12 through a waiver process that could readily be incorporated
13 into the rules. And there are considerable amounts of
14 telephone equipment out there that utilized stutter dial
15 tone. The central office equipment, it has it available.
16 And that's something that could have been incorporated. It
17 could have been incorporated a number of years ago, but it
18 just simply hasn't done it.

19 And of course, the second item is the DSL options
20 that we're looking at now and the ability to get that
21 incorporated. I realize there's still some process where we
22 are looking at or questions in terms of the T(1) E(1) areas,
23 the spectrum density problems, or was it problems, but
24 rather the spectrum density issues.

25 And so, that's another area -- the two main areas

1 that I would be concerned with.

2 MS. MAGNOTTI: Is there a specific rule part that
3 exists now that addresses the DSL?

4 MR. SHINN: No.

5 MS. MAGNOTTI: The problem is it doesn't exist,
6 right?

7 MR. SALINAS: A generalized comment is -- there
8 specifically is no technical rule that slows the issuing of
9 new technology. The major issue is making changes in the
10 FCC rule to upgrade to new technology.

11 MS. MAGNOTTI: That's what I'm talking about. I'm
12 asking if there are specific FCC rules that would need to be
13 upgraded frequently, and that because of our rulemaking
14 process, take too long in terms of getting an answer. No?

15 MR. SHINN: I don't think that the dynamics of the
16 industry is changing where you're going to need rule changes
17 on a constant basis, where you're constantly changing
18 something. I think pretty much once you're set, they're
19 prestatic (phonetic) for a while.

20 And so, as far as specific rules that's going to
21 need change daily, I don't see one.

22 MS. MAGNOTTI: Well, we have a waiver -- we have
23 waiver requests in now to change existing rules. That's why
24 I was asking if you all would identify -- if there's
25 specific rules that need to be waived a lot now. You

1 mentioned stutter dial tone, and I wonder if there are
2 others.

3 Chuck?

4 MR. BERESTECKY: Well, my name is Chuck
5 Berestecky, contractor to Lucent. I'm actually here
6 speaking for TIA. And I go back also to the '70s on Part
7 68. I was at the Bell Labs and arguing with John probably
8 of the type of rules that should be put in.

9 But Susan, I'm not quite clear on your question,
10 but if I think where you come from is, I think the rules in
11 the signal power area are what prohibit the connection of
12 new technology. And I think a lot of that gets to the fact
13 that we have twisted pairs out there.

14 You've heard Trone. You've heard others talk
15 about the working going on in T(1) E(1).4. And I haven't
16 seen the specifics, but I know that it is bringing it up to
17 date to the '90s. It also maybe a generic requirement.

18 I think that's the type of a thing that we need to
19 address and we need to address very rapidly. We can't go
20 through the long rulemaking process that we've done when we
21 did a harmonized Part 68.

22 I was a chairman of that committee that wrote the
23 harmonized Party 68. Took us a little while to figure out
24 how to do it. Once we did it, we submitted it, and it took
25 quite a while for the FCC to react.

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

1 Give your proposals this afternoon. I think that
2 will get at issues that maybe we can speed this up. But at
3 the technical rule level, I think the spectrum management is
4 where the biggest problem is. That's at least my own
5 opinion. I think the other areas are not as significant as
6 that area.

7 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. Yes?

8 MR. BISHOP: Yes. Susan, you need -- we do need
9 signal power limits in order to prevent cross-talk. So as
10 far as new technologies go, it's not a case that there's a
11 particular rule in Part 68 that's standing in the way of new
12 technology. It's more a case of there's no rules in Part 68
13 that cover the new technology.

14 As we said before, most of the rules were based on
15 phone company services. So you have the signal power limits
16 related to voice grade services. Signal power limited
17 related to say, DS1 and a few other services. But there are
18 no rules specifically for DSL. And there needs to be some.

19 The particular work in T(1) E(1).4 is good because
20 they will come up with a set of power spectral density
21 templates that can be used to limit both the frequency and
22 the amplitude of signals for various DSL classes. They're
23 working on about six classes. Three of the classes relate
24 directly to standards-based systems such as ADSL and HDSL,
25 too.

1 There are some other classes, though, that have
2 been requested for nonstandards-based technologies. And
3 many manufacturers have been interested in that. And so
4 some rules will be made for those classes, also.

5 And this is an example of what I call a generic
6 rule. It doesn't have a particular technology in mind, but
7 it has a particular bandwidth and signal power limit
8 specified. So therefore, a manufacturer could take
9 advantage if we wanted to develop new DSL equipment, he'd
10 have six choices of where he could fit his signals into.
11 And of course then, if he needs some other -- a seventh
12 class, then the industry ought to be able to work that issue
13 out and come up with a new seventh class, too.

14 So I feel like the trend should be towards more
15 generic rules. Rules that can apply to groups of equipment,
16 rather than specific services that a company may offer. I
17 think that's the way that Part 68 could be changed, help the
18 introduction of new technologies.

19 MS. MAGNOTTI: You were saying that before the
20 break. And I thought I heard you identify specific rule
21 sections that should be generic and that are not now.

22 MR. BISHOP: Yeah.

23 MS. MAGNOTTI: Which are those?

24 MR. BISHOP: Well, let's take the hazardous
25 voltage limits for a second. If you look at those rules,

1 they're related around interfaces whereby the customer
2 premises equipment puts -- intentionally puts voltages out
3 towards the network.

4 Really, there's not a whole lot of times that CPE
5 does that. But there are a few times with a few interfaces
6 like PBX off-prem stations, E&M signaling. And so, in those
7 cases where the CPE is intentionally generating voltages,
8 you want to have some limit on those voltages. And you want
9 that equipment tested to make sure that the voltage stays
10 within those limits.

11 That's the case of where -- let's say you had a
12 new technology that you wanted to put voltage out towards a
13 network. To me, the industry ought to be able to come up
14 with a generic set of rules. What are we concerned with
15 here? And come up with a generic set of rules to limit the
16 voltage put out by CPE, rather than relate it to a
17 particular type of interface such as off-prem station or
18 E&M.

19 So that would be one example. And we ought to be
20 able to do this, I believe, for signal -- certainly, in T(1)
21 E(1).4, we're doing it for transverse balance limits. There
22 you can come up with generic balance limits for all
23 equipment, based on how much balance is needed across
24 particular frequency bandwidths. So it wouldn't be
25 technology independent. It wouldn't matter what the

1 interface was or the particular type of interface. They'd
2 be able to use those same balance limits.

3 MR. BERRESFORD: Mr. Bishop?

4 MR. BISHOP: Yeah?

5 MR. BERRESFORD: On the hazardous voltage, that's
6 always a situation in which the customer or the person or
7 the CPE causing harm to your network will be your customer,
8 won't it?

9 MR. BISHOP: Well, in today's environment, it'd be
10 some carrier's customer, yeah.

11 MR. BERRESFORD: But if the trouble's being -- if
12 the hazardous voltage is being produced onto a line say, in
13 Philadelphia, that CPE in Philadelphia that's causing that
14 voltage?

15 MR. BISHOP: Right.

16 MR. BERRESFORD: Why isn't that a problem that you
17 can deal with through contract or tariff with your customer,
18 and that you don't need the power of the government for?

19 MR. BISHOP: You know, that one narrow issue, I
20 could probably put a rule in my tariff that said if you
21 order this type of channel, you're going to be expected to
22 meet this particular voltage limit. I could probably do
23 that. And I think Bell-South could do that, and SBC could
24 do that. And we -- I think the issue might be that we all
25 might not come up with the same number. It might be 80

1 volts in Bell-Atlantic. It might be 70 volts in Bell-South.
2 It might be -- you know, we could come up with different
3 values.

4 Also, to get this into our state tariffs, we would
5 then have to go through state regulators. So they'd
6 probably want to hold hearings on this and discuss why we're
7 doing this. You know, do we really need this value of
8 voltage?

9 So over the long run, I can see where you'd end up
10 probably with different regulations in different states.

11 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. Did you have other areas
12 that should be generic?

13 MR. BISHOP: Yeah.

14 MS. MAGNOTTI: You mentioned hazardous voltage and
15 transverse balance limits?

16 MR. BISHOP: Yeah. And the signal power limits
17 certainly, if that could be -- that those rules could be
18 made generic, I think manufacturers would be very happy
19 about that. I can't -- I don't have the answer today for
20 that.

21 However, I do know that if you deal -- we did deal
22 with this in T(1) E(1).4 for digital subscriber line
23 technologies. We were able to come up with a
24 classifications that were not based on any standard. And
25 they're intentionally made for nonstandard DSLs. And so, I

1 believe that same process could be applied a little bit more
2 generically to come up with rules.

3 MS. MAGNOTTI: Any other comments from the
4 industry on that issue?

5 MR. SALINAS: Yes. Comment being that -- do not
6 weigh too heavily on the generic signal pattern because the
7 T(1) signal -- the standard T(1) signal, its pattern, how it
8 hits the line, the level it hits the line is going to be
9 totally different than a voice analogue signal, which how it
10 hits the line, how -- what level it hits the line, which is
11 going to be totally different than an ADSL.

12 Even within ADSLs, for example, in the T(1) E(1)
13 committee, we're all working on spectrum management, but at
14 the same time they're also working on two-wire HDSL. One of
15 the rules set into two wire HDSL is a power cutback feature
16 to keep people from hitting the line too hot when the line
17 is too short.

18 So that generic rule is going to be on generic,
19 yes, but on top of technology. You cannot just go across
20 the board and say, "I've got one generic rule." That does
21 not apply.

22 There's a difference between analogue and digital.
23 There's a difference between digital types.

24 MS. MAGNOTTI: Okay. Mr. Pinkham?

25 MR. PINKHAM: Okay, comment from a manufacturer

1 here. We've heard a lot of carriers.

2 Let me support Trone's request that there do be
3 generic requirements. But to your point -- I'm sorry --

4 MR. SALINAS: Jimmy Salinas --

5 MR. PINKHAM: -- Jimmy, I think that those generic
6 requirements have to be defined in terms of what you really
7 want, as opposed to what is convenient. If it's a signal
8 power at the central office that's of concern, then that's
9 what should be defined.

10 Those of us in the design business -- I'm an old
11 design engineer from way back -- basically, we'll play by
12 whatever rules you want to make. Just stop screwing around
13 with them, please.

14 We can take any technical requirement and develop
15 something that works reasonably well and do a pretty good
16 job with it. And we'll come up with something that's cheap
17 in the long run. But if we're hampered by a myriad of rules
18 that are basically understandable -- are not understandable,
19 we really don't know how to go about it.

20 The telephone regulations, unfortunately,
21 developed sort of piecemeal. And quite often instead of
22 being specified in terms of volts milliamps, DBs, whatever,
23 are broken down into a series of services based on different
24 lines. And frankly, somebody who hasn't been in the
25 business since 1970 odd, doesn't even understand all the

1 terms, let alone know how to meet these requirements.

2 It would be very, very nice to have a generic set
3 of requirements in real engineering terms, volts, milliamps,
4 DBs, whatever, that specify what harm to the network really
5 is in terms of some particular parameter, at some particular
6 point. Something we can understand, and we can work with.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. SCHROEDER: A few people just now have
9 mentioned the need for generic rules. Clint, though, you
10 were saying we need some specifics.

11 I guess one thing I'm interested in is how
12 specific the FCC's rules have to be, as opposed to whatever
13 industry standards an SDO might adopt with our approval, I
14 guess, or our backing. And I guess what I'm asking is, you
15 know, can the FCC rules, the new Part 68, just say, "Thou
16 shalt not cause harm to the network." Would that give an
17 industry group sufficient guidance, or should we spell out
18 the current four different types of harm? You know, how
19 much farther do we need to go beyond that?

20 Paul?

21 MR. HART: I think you need a combination, and
22 that's one of the reasons that I suggested in my opening
23 comments that we need to spend some time, and certainly we
24 will, to figure out exactly how we're going to make this
25 work. I mean, you've probably got a great opportunity here

1 because the industry is jumping for an opportunity to help
2 figure out how to work this.

3 So somewhere I think, there's got to be a basic
4 set of conditions that are probably in the Part 68 rules now
5 that are going to have to be reaffirmed as a basis for all
6 of this. And then you can move into the consideration,
7 because -- the consideration of how to deal with
8 incorporating the results of an SDO activity into the rules.
9 And hopefully, it can be as simple as saying the T(1) E(1).4
10 standard, et cetera, with its full reference, is
11 incorporated as a requirement for this.

12 And we'd have to figure out how to deal with
13 modifications to it and so on and so forth. But I think
14 that kind of an approach would be workable. But there's
15 going to have to be some remaining framework that the
16 Commission -- it would seem to me, anyway. That the
17 Commission would have to maintain as part of its permanent
18 rule-set to govern this whole process. But hopefully, you
19 would not have to -- you could abandon practically all
20 detailed technical rules and cast those into industry
21 bodies. I'd look forward to that, anyway.

22 Trone?

23 MR. BISHOP: I think there's a definite need for
24 specific rules in volts and milliamps and DBs and what-have-
25 you for manufacturers to follow. And not only that, it then